

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1-7, 9-11, 14 and 16-19, and leaves claims 8, 12, 13, 15 and 20 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-20.

Claims 2, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention. Various amendments were made throughout claims 2, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16 and 17 to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 2, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16 and 17 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made throughout claims 2, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16 and 17 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in the Office Action.

It is noted that the Examiner indicated in paragraph 9 of the Office Action that claims 4, 5, 7-9 and 11-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Amendments were made to claims 4, 5, 7-9 and 11-15 to place them in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 4, 5, 7-9 and 11-15 are now allowable as indicated by the Examiner.

It is noted that claim 10 depends from allowable base claim 9 and claim 16 depends from allowable base claim 13. Therefore, applicants submit that claims 10 and 16 are also now allowable for the same reasons as claims 9 and 13.

It is still further noted that some inconsistency regarding the status of the claims exists in the Office Action. For example, the Examiner as noted above indicated in paragraph 9 of the Office Action that claim 9 would be allowable, whereas in paragraph 7 of the Office Action the Examiner indicated that claims 9, 10 which depends on claim 9, and 16 were rejected.

Applicants assume that paragraph 9 of the Office Action is correct being that claim 9 originally depended on claim 3 and recites further features and details regarding an editor similar to claim 5 and claim 16 as noted above depends on claim 13 an allowable base claim. Therefore, applicants submit that it is correct that claims 9, 10 and 16 are also now allowable.

Claims 1-3, 6 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beezer (U.S. Patent No. 7,028,267). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1-3, 6 and 17-20 are not taught or suggested by Beezer whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to recite that the present invention is directed to a document review support apparatus, a method for supporting review of a document and a program for implementing the method for supporting review of a document.

According to the present invention the document review support apparatus includes a storage which stores position-attribute management

information defining items of position information to be acquired from a document to be reviewed, the position-attribute management information being stored independently from the document to be reviewed, an input unit which receives, from an user, an input including a designation of a position in the document to be reviewed at which a comment is to be added to comments currently associated with the document to be reviewed, and the comment, and an acquiring unit, responsive to the input from the input unit, which acquires the position information from a position designated by the user in accordance with the position-attribute management information and the storage and stores, as an entry to comment-solution management information defining a comment and a solution to the comment, the position information and the comment to be added in the storage such that the position information and comment information of the document to be added are correlated to each other.

Further, according to the present invention the document review support apparatus includes, a search unit, coupled with the input unit and the acquiring unit, which searches, from the position-attribute management information and the comments-solution management information stored in the storage, the position information and the comments currently associated with the document to be reviewed, and a display unit, coupled to the search unit, which collectively displays at least position information, the comment to be added and the comments currently associated with the document to be reviewed so as to correlate, on a display screen at positions indicated by the at least position information, the comment to be added and the comments currently associated with the document to be reviewed to each other.

The novel features of the present invention as recited in the claims is that the user is allowed to add comments as represented by comment information to comments currently associated with a document, to correlate the comment information of the comment to be added, the comments currently associated with the document and position information in the document to each other and to display the comment information of the comment to be added and the comments currently associated with the document at the appropriate position in the document as indicated by the position information.

The above described features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the other references of record whether said references are taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Beezer.

Beezer teaches a system and method for capturing, displaying, and navigating text annotations in a non-modifiable document. In Beezer, upon a determination that a text annotation is to be created, the system determines the file position of the selected object. The file position of the selected object as per Beezer is stored along with the created text annotation in another file or a non-read only portion of a file storing the document. Using the file position, the text annotation may be properly identified with the selected object without modifying the non-modifiable document. In Beezer once a text annotation is displayed a user may easily navigate among the captured annotations.

However, in Beezer the objects to which a comment can be provided in the document to be reviewed is very limited. In Beezer the objects to which a comment can be provided in the document is limited to text. On the other hand, Applicants' invention enables a comment to be applied (added) to objects other than the text of a document to be reviewed. The comments according to the present invention can be added to drawings, tables and most importantly to another comment that is currently associated with the document to be reviewed. That is according to the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims, another new comment can be added to a comment currently associated with the document to be reviewed. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Beezer.

Applicants' invention as now more clearly recited in the claims enables to integrally and unitarily manage comments to be added to other comments currently associated with the document and displaying the comments to be added to the comments currently associated with the document for applications having a plurality of different formats that is not possible nor contemplated by Beezer.

Thus, Beezer fails to teach or suggest a storage unit which stores position attribute management information defining items of position information to be acquired from a document to be reviewed, wherein the position attribute management information is stored independently from the document to be reviewed as recited in the claims.

Further, Beezer fails to teach or suggest an acquiring unit, responsive to the input from the input unit, which acquires the position information from a position designated by the user in accordance with the position attribute

management information in the storage and stores, as an entry to comment solution management information defining a comment and a solution, the position information and the comment to be added in the storage such that the position information and comment information of the comment to be added are correlated to each other as recited in the claims.

a search unit, coupled with said input unit and said acquiring unit, which searches, from the position-attribute management information and the comment-solution management information stored in said storage, said position information and said comments currently comment-associated with said document to be reviewed; and

a display unit, coupled with the search unit, which collectively displays at least position information, said comment to be added and comments currently a comment-associated with said document so as to correlate, on a display screen at positions indicated by said at least position information, said comments to be added and said comments currently associated with said document and the comment to each other

Still further, Beezer fails to teach or suggest a search unit, coupled to the input unit and the acquiring unit, which searches, from the position attribute management information and the comment solution management information stored in the storage, the position information and the comment currently associated with the document to be reviewed as recited in the claims.

Still further yet, Beezer fails to teach or suggest a display unit, coupled to the search unit, which collectively displays at least position information, the comment to be added and comments currently associated with the document

so as to correlate, on a display screen at positions indicated by the at least position information, the comments to be added and the comments currently associated with the document to each other as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Beezer fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims and as such does not anticipate nor render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 6 and 17-20 as being unpatentable over Beezer is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 1-3, 6 and 17-20.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (ASA-1163).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120